

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 are pending in the application and the same are rejected. By this amendment, claims 1, 8, and 13 are amended. Accordingly, claims 1-19 remain in the application and are presented for review and further consideration by the Examiner.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-6 and 8-18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Dodd et al., U.S. Patent No. 3,809,263. (Examiner's Action, page 2, ¶ 2).

In response, Applicant has amended claims 1, 8, and 13 to include wording that the object is disposed radially outward of a perimeter of a latching hub. These amendments do not add new matter as Figures 1-4 clearly show the object is disposed radially outward of a perimeter of the latching hub.

Dodd discloses two circular plates (24, 26) between which an article (12) is received. The article (12) is clearly within the perimeter of the circular plates (24, 26) and not radially outward of the perimeter of the circular plates (Figures 1, 2, and 2A). The Examiner considers the two circular plates (24, 26), together, to form a latching hub. Since the article (12) is not disposed radially outward of the two circular plates (24, 26), Dodd does not disclose an object disposed radially outward of a perimeter of a latching hub.

In contrast, Applicant's independent claims 1, 8, and 13, as amended, include wording that the object is disposed radially outward of a perimeter of the latching hub. Since Dodd clearly discloses an article within the perimeter of two circular plates, Dodd does not disclose this limitation of Applicant's independent claims 1, 8, and 13.

The Examiner has rejected claims 7 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dodd et al., U.S. Patent No. 3,809,263, as applied to claims 1 and 13 above, and further in view of Teranishi. (Examiner's Action, page 4, ¶ 4).

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

In view of Applicant's arguments and amendments with respect to independent claims 1, 8, and 13 being allowable, Applicants respectfully submit that the remaining dependent claims are also allowable because they contain all of the limitations of their respective independent claims and further add structural and functional limitations.

The foregoing amendments and arguments are believed to be a complete response to the most recent Examiner's Action.


No new matter has been added.

It is respectfully submitted that there is no claim, teaching, motivation, or suggestion in any of the cited art, alone or in combination, to produce what Applicant claims.

It is further submitted that the application, as amended, defines patentable subject matter and that the claims are in a condition for allowance. Such allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

Should any issues remain which would preclude the prompt disposition of this case, it is requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned practitioner by telephone.

Respectfully submitted,
Robin P. Yergenson

By 
Mark G. Pannell
Reg. No. 40,761

Date 06/14/2004
(719) 260-7900